OSU-M-96-1
DUKE-TH-96-103
WIS-95-62-PH
hep-th/9601108

arXiv:hep-th/9601108v2 17 Mar 1996

Enhanced Gauge Symmetry in Type II String Theory

Sheldon Katz[a], David R. Morrison[b], and M. Ronen Plesser[c]

[a]Department of Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA
[b]Department of Mathematics, Duke University, Box 90320, Durham, NC 27708-0320, USA
[c]Department of Particle Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

We show how enhanced gauge symmetry in type II string theory compactified on a Calabi–Yau threefold arises from singularities in the geometry of the target space. When the target space of the type IIA string acquires a genus g curve C of A_{N-1} singularities, we find that an $SU(N)$ gauge theory with g adjoint hypermultiplets appears at the singularity. The new massless states correspond to solitons wrapped about the collapsing cycles, and their dynamics is described by a twisted supersymmetric gauge theory on $C \times \mathbf{R}^4$. We reproduce this result from an analysis of the S-dual D-manifold. We check that the predictions made by this model about the nature of the Higgs branch, the monodromy of period integrals, and the asymptotics of the one-loop topological amplitude are in agreement with geometrical computations. In one of our examples we find that the singularity occurs at strong coupling in the heterotic dual proposed by Kachru and Vafa.

1/96; revised 3/96

1. Introduction

Recent progress in string theory has involved the application of new techniques to study nonperturbative effects. These include string-string duality which relates heterotic to type II string theory. This duality is quite well understood in six-dimensional examples (and in $\mathcal{N}$=4 supersymmetric models in four dimensions obtained from these) where it relates strong to weak coupling [1–7]. There are in addition a number of examples of $\mathcal{N}$=2 models in four dimensions for which conjectured dual formulations have been proposed [8,9]. Much less is understood about this duality in four dimensions, but it clearly requires that nonabelian gauge symmetry appear at special points in the type II moduli space [10–13].

Nonperturbative physics has been probed in another context in the study of singularities in the moduli space of perturbative vacua of type II string theory. In particular, for vacua realized as Calabi–Yau compactifications, the singularities in moduli space where the target space acquires conifold singularities have been understood as resulting from the existence of solitonic states whose mass vanishes at the singular points [14]. These states are in hypermultiplets of the $\mathcal{N}$=2 algebra in four dimensions, and are charged under the abelian symmetry gauged by the Ramond-Ramond vector fields. When the spectrum of massless states is such that the moduli space of supersymmetric vacua in the gauge theory contains a Higgs branch, the transition to the Higgs phase has been interpreted as describing a topology-changing transition to the moduli space of another Calabi–Yau manifold [15]. In this work, we study the singularities in Calabi–Yau moduli space which give rise to nonabelian gauge symmetry. As anticipated in [11–13], such enhanced gauge symmetry is associated to the presence of *curves of singularities* C on the Calabi–Yau manifold. We study the spectrum and dynamics of the massless solitons in this case, exhibiting the origins of the enhanced symmetry.

In order to stay at finite distance in the Calabi–Yau moduli space, we must restrict our attention to singular Calabi–Yau spaces which can be resolved by a Calabi–Yau manifold [16], in other words, the Calabi–Yau space should have only so-called *canonical singularities*. It has long been known in the mathematics literature [17] that at the generic point of a curve of canonical singularities on a Calabi–Yau space, the transverse singularity is a quotient singularity $\mathbf{C}^2/G$ (which can be resolved by an ALE space). We consider in this paper the case in which the curve of singularities is smooth and irreducible, the singularity type is constant along the entire curve, and $G = \mathbf{Z}/N\mathbf{Z}$ so that the singularity is of type

A_{N-1}. An example with two intersecting curves of singularities was discussed (from a different point of view) in [12]; examples in which the singularity type is allowed to change along the curve are currently under study [18].

Concretely, we study type IIA models with a singularity in codimension $N-1$ in moduli space at which the manifold acquires a genus g curve of A_{N-1} singularities. The singularity can be smoothed to obtain a smooth, topologically distinct manifold generalizing the conifold transitions studied in [15]. We find that in this case the four-dimensional effective field theory describing the low-energy dynamics is an $\mathcal{N}=2$ gauge theory with gauge group $SU(N)$ and g hypermultiplets transforming in the adjoint representation. We make some assumptions in obtaining this result, and these are verified by a detailed comparison of the predictions of this model to geometrical computations in a list of examples. These include the local geometry of the moduli space, the properties of the Higgs branch (moduli space of the manifold obtained after smoothing), monodromy of period integrals (in the type IIB representation of the model using mirror symmetry) and asymptotic behavior of the one-loop topological amplitude.

We restrict our attention to the case $g>1$. In [13] the case of a degeneration in the fibers of a $K3$ fibration of a Calabi–Yau space (in which each fiber acquires a single A_{N-1} singularity) was considered. This is a special case of a *rational* curve of singularities (i.e., $g=0$)[1]; the enhanced gauge symmetry was observed in the limit of infinite area for the singular curve. This is consistent with the extension of our result to this case. The pure $\mathcal{N}=2$ Yang–Mills theory is asymptotically free and the nonabelian symmetry is only restored in the extreme high-energy (weak-coupling) limit. In an example this was directly observed in the dual heterotic theory in [8,10]. The other special case $g=1$ leads, according to our rule of g matter hypermultiplets, to the $\mathcal{N}=4$ theory in four dimensions. In this (conformal) model the nonabelian gauge symmetry is restored at the origin of the Coulomb branch, where the low-energy physics is described by a nontrivial interacting conformal field theory; the Higgs branch is absent. In [12] the case of a degeneration in the $K3$ factor of a $K3\times T^2$ compactification (which has $\mathcal{N}=4$ supersymmetry at generic points) was shown to conform to this prediction. Our analysis suggests that the singular behavior depends only on the local form of the singularity and hence the results for these special cases should extend more generally.

[1] As Aspinwall has pointed out to us, it may be possible to find examples with $g>0$ using his construction by relaxing the requirement imposed in [13] of trivial monodromy of the Picard lattice.

One of the models we study in detail has a conjectured heterotic dual [8]. It is interesting that the singularity we study occurs in the strong coupling region of the heterotic model.[2] Thus the enhanced symmetry is presumably a nonperturbative effect in the heterotic model as well, distinct from the well-known appearance of enhanced symmetries in the conformal field theory. It would be extremely interesting to understand the phenomenon from the point of view of the heterotic theory.

The paper is organized as follows. In section two we study the dynamics of the light solitons near the singular point in moduli space. The essential pont is that the topology of the two-cycles whose area shrinks to zero at the singularity is completely determined by the singularity in the space transverse to C. Locally on C, we thus have a situation similar to the case of an A_{N-1} point on $K3$, leading to an enhanced gauge symmetry in an effective six-dimensional theory. In our case, the light states propagate in a six-dimensional spacetime of the form $C \times \mathbf{R}^4$, and their dynamics is governed by a twisted supersymmetric gauge theory on this space. The twisting is essentially determined by the requirement of $\mathcal{N}$=2 supersymmetry in the effective four-dimensional theory. We use this model to make some detailed predictions about the geometry of the Calabi–Yau moduli space near the singularity. These are checked by geometrical computations in the next section, and we find complete agreement. We find a dual description of this in terms of D-strings on a D-manifold, refining the proposal of [12,19]. In this context the twisting we found is related to that studied in [20].

In section three, we study the local geometry of the Calabi–Yau space and the moduli space near the singularity, verifying the predictions of the previous section in detail. We observe the expected action of the Weyl group of A_{N-1} for both the type IIA and type IIB models and also see the structure of the A_{N-1} root lattice geometrically in several different forms. For the type IIB model, A_{N-1} enters into the description in essentially the same way that it enters into the deformation theory of A_{N-1} singularities. The moduli space of conformal field theories fails to be a product of the complex and Kähler moduli spaces. (One must instead take the quotient of a product by a finite group.) For the type IIA model, the key ingredient in the analysis is the notion of an elementary transformation, which consists of an involution on the second cohomology of the target manifold with properties

[2] The locus in moduli space at which we are finding enhanced gauge symmetry at strong (heterotic) coupling is completely disjoint from the locus of weak-coupling enhanced gauge symmetry discussed in [8,10,13].

similar to those of a flop. We match the geometry of certain extremal transitions with the properties of the branches of our gauge theoretic model. We also check the monodromy and one-loop amplitude against our predictions in several examples, and find complete agreement.

In section four we describe our detailed calculations in two specific examples. These are the two-parameter model of [8], which is of interest because of the existence of a conjectured heterotic dual, and a model exhibiting $SU(3)$ gauge symmetry at the transition.

2. Soliton Dynamics

The type II string theories which we consider have two geometric representations: as a IIA theory on a certain Calabi–Yau manifold M, or as a IIB theory on its mirror partner W. (These two representations are believed to be equivalent even when nonperturbative effects are taken into account [14,21,22].) We will use both models interchangeably. The low-energy theory in four dimensions is $\mathcal{N}{=}2$ supersymmetric; the spectrum at generic points in the moduli space contains $n_V{=}h^{21}(W){=}h^{11}(M)$ massless vector multiplets and $n_H{=}h^{11}(W)+1{=}h^{21}(M)+1$ massless hypermultiplets. The moduli space is parameterized by the expectation values of the scalars in these multiplets. Since the dilaton is in a hypermultiplet, the nonrenormalization theorem of [14,23] guarantees that the geometry of the moduli space of the scalars in the vector multiplets can be computed exactly at string tree level. These moduli correspond geometrically to complex structure deformations of W, or equivalently to (complexified) Kähler deformations of M.

From the IIA perspective, a singularity in the conformal field theory will occur if the Kähler class approaches a face of the Kähler cone, with the B-field taking an appropriate value.[3] Each face of the Kähler cone (we have in mind faces which may be of high codimension) determines a collection of holomorphic 2-spheres whose area shrinks to zero as the face is approached. These 2-spheres can be contracted to points at the expense of introducing singularities into the new space.[4] It was Strominger's insight [14] that nonperturbative effects will "cancel" these singularities, leading to nonsingular physics.

[3] The fact that this singularity can be avoided by judicious choice of the B-field was employed in [24,25] to argue that conformal field theory could be extended beyond the boundary set by the Kähler cone. However, here we must consider what happens when the singularity is approached, not avoided.

[4] Actually, because of worldsheet instanton effects the singularity will occur at a finite area for the 2-spheres.

A simple case to consider is the one in which only a finite number of 2-spheres on M are contracted by this process—this is the case studied in [14,15] (albeit from the IIB perspective). Another simple case is one in which a divisor is contracted to a smooth curve. In this paper we consider a slight generalization of that second case, in which a collection of $N-1$ divisors is contracted to a smooth curve of genus g. We assume that the singularities along the curve are uniformly of type A_{N-1}.[5] In this section we seek to understand the properties of the light solitonic states in the vicinity of this singularity.

The transverse A_{N-1} singularity is resolved by an ALE space. The cycles which shrink to zero area are described by a chain of $N-1$ two-spheres Γ_i in this space, with their intersection matrix corresponding to the Dynkin diagram of A_{N-1}. As we move about C these spheres sweep out $N-1$ divisors E_i on M. In homology there are then $(N-1)$ shrinking two-cycles Γ_i, and $N-1$ shrinking four-cycles E_i. The soliton states we consider are described by two-branes wrapping about the two-cycles A^{ij} for $i \leq j$ represented by the chain $\Gamma_i \cup \Gamma_{i+1} \cup \cdots \cup \Gamma_j$. (We call these the *collapsing cycles*.) Under the $U(1)^{N-1}$ symmetry gauged by the Ramond-Ramond superpartners of the moduli corresponding to E_i, their charges correspond to the positive roots of A_{N-1}; the negative roots correspond to orientation-reversed wrappings. [6]

2.1. The Soliton Spectrum

The massless states associated to two-branes wrapping around A are in some sense intermediate between two cases that have recently been studied. In [14,15] the case of isolated rational curves in a Calabi–Yau space was studied, and these were found to lead to massless hypermultiplets in the effective four-dimensional $\mathcal{N}=2$ field theory, with $U(1)$ charges determined by their homology class. Our case differs from this in that we have a two-dimensional moduli space of such curves (given by C). In [3,5] the case of rational curves on a $K3$ manifold was studied. Here the particle states were found to fill out a massive vector multiplet of the $\mathcal{N}=(1,1)$ supersymmetric theory in six dimensions with

[5] There is evidence that similar results apply if the singularities are more complicated at finitely many points of the curve [18].

[6] There are additional massless solitons from four-branes wrapping around the shrinking four-cycles A_D. These are magnetically charged states. As we shall see, world-sheet instantons correct their masses, leading to agreement with the monopole masses in the gauge theory description. These should not be considered independent degrees of freedom in the low-energy description. We thank N. Seiberg for a helpful comment.

gauge group $SU(N)$. The gauge indices arise, as described in the previous paragraph, from the labeling of the two-cycles. Our models are similar to this in that there is a separation of scales between the size of Γ_i and the size of C, which can be arbitrarily large since the size of C is a modulus of the singular locus. Thus we can approximately think of the low-energy theory as a compactification on C of the six-dimensional theory obtained by including the massless solitons wrapping around A^{ij}.

If we adopt this picture too naïvely we will of course run into difficulties. The compactification on $C \times \mathbf{R}^4$ will not be supersymmetric because C has no covariantly constant spinor. The supersymmetry that acts in six dimensions must be *twisted*, as recently proposed in [20] in a different context. Heuristically, we can think of the twisting as follows. The approximation in which we find the six-dimensional theory relies on the existence of a neighborhood of E_i in M which fibers over C. The fibration however is nontrivial, and this must in some way predict the twisting. We do not know how to compute this effect directly, but as we shall see the twist is almost uniquely determined by the requirement that the four-dimensional effective theory exhibit $\mathcal{N}$=2 supersymmetry.

In flat space the six-dimensional theory contains a vector V_M, a complex scalar ϕ, and two fermions, all in the adjoint representation of $SU(N)$. The charged components are the soliton states; the $N-1$ neutral components are supplied by the $N-1$ moduli of the ALE space. The fields transform under a global $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ R-symmetry. The compactification breaks the local Lorentz group as $SO(6) \to SO(4) \times U(1)$, and the reduction leads to the following representations carried by the fields and the supercharges

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} & SO(4) & \times & U(1) & \times & SU(2) & \times & SU(2) \\ V_\mu & (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) & & 0 & & \mathbf{1} & & \mathbf{1} \\ V_{++} & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) & & 1 & & \mathbf{1} & & \mathbf{1} \\ V_{--} & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) & & -1 & & \mathbf{1} & & \mathbf{1} \\ \phi & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) & & 0 & & \mathbf{2} & & \mathbf{2} \\ \psi & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) & & 1/2 & & \mathbf{2} & & \mathbf{1} \\ \lambda & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) & & -1/2 & & \mathbf{1} & & \mathbf{2} \\ Q_\alpha & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) & & 1/2 & & \mathbf{1} & & \mathbf{2} \\ \bar{Q}_\alpha & (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) & & -1/2 & & \mathbf{2} & & \mathbf{1} \end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

where boldface numbers give the dimension of the representation, and $SO(4)$ representations are labeled using the local isomorphism $SO(4) \sim SU(2) \times SU(2)$.

A twist [26] is a choice of an exotic action of the $U(1)$ local Lorentz transformation group of C, as a subgroup $U(1)'$ of $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$. The unbroken supersymmetry is generated by the supercharges that are scalars under this action. We expect the twisted

theory to exhibit $\mathcal{N}$=2 supersymmetry in four dimensions, and this requirement leaves two possible twists. The one we will use (and we justify eliminating the other by the results) is

$$J' = J_L - J_3^{(1)} - J_3^{(2)} \ , \tag{2.2}$$

where J_L is the "standard" Lorentz generator, and the other two correspond to the Cartan elements of the $SU(2)$'s. In four dimensions the global symmetry is the subgroup of $U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$ which commutes with the holonomy (in other words, with $U(1)'$). This will give the $SU(2)_R \times U(1)$ R-symmetry of the four-dimensional theory.

The massless modes in four dimensions arise from zero modes of the relevant differential operators on C. Thus states with $U(1)'$ charge zero lead to one massless particle in four dimensions, corresponding to the unique (constant) holomorphic function on C. These comprise an $\mathcal{N}$=2 vector multiplet, including V_μ, a complex scalar made from the two neutral components of ϕ, and the neutral components of the fermions. States with charge ± 1 lead to a massless particle for each (anti-) holomorphic 1-form on C, thus to precisely g particles. These comprise g hypermultiplets including all of the remaining fields.

We can see here the two special cases $g \leq 1$. For g=0, there are no massless hypermultiplets and we find the pure Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions [13]. For g=1 there is no holonomy and we will find the full $SU(4)$ R-symmetry of four-dimensional $\mathcal{N}$=4 gauge theory in four dimensions, though only a maximal subgroup is manifest in (2.1). In this case the magnetically charged states corresponding to four-branes wrapping four-cycles do not receive logarithmic corrections to their masses. The $\mathcal{N}$=4 theory has an electric-magnetic duality exchanging electrically charged states with magnetically charged ones. In our case this is manifestly accomplished by $\rho \to -1/\rho$ where ρ is the Kähler modulus of the torus. We thus see the expected relation of T-duality for the IIB theory with S-duality of the heterotic dual [27,3].

In general we predict that the low-energy theory near the singularity will be described by four-dimensional $\mathcal{N}$=2 supersymmetric gauge theory with gauge group $SU(N)$ and g hypermultiplets of matter in the adjoint representation. The other possible twist mentioned above is easily seen to lead in four dimensions to pure Yang–Mills theory. As we shall see in the next section, this does not describe the singularity correctly. It would be very interesting to compute the twisting directly, as was done in [20] for the situation studied there. In both of the special cases we saw explicitly that the modulus of the IIA theory corresponding to the area of C represents the gauge coupling in the effective field theory. It is natural to assume that this holds for g>1 as well.

2.2. Predicting the Local Geometry

We have asserted that at the singularity in question the spectrum of massless states is the same as that of $\mathcal{N}$=2 supersymmetric $SU(N)$ gauge theory with g hypermultiplets transforming in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. The structure of the moduli space predicted by this model in the vicinity of the singularity can be reliably computed at the classical level, since the theory is not asymptotically free (for $g > 1$).

In $\mathcal{N}$=1 superfield notation, the massless fields in the theory are the (real) vector multiplet in the adjoint V_a, with field strength W_α^a; a (complex) chiral superfield in the adjoint Φ^a (comprising the vector multiplet described above); and $2g$ chiral superfields M_a^i and $\tilde{M}_a^i$ in the adjoint (comprising the g hypermultiplets), where i runs from 1 to g.

Under the $SU(2)_R$ symmetry discussed in the previous subsection the scalars m and $\tilde{m}$ are a doublet, while the bosons in V and Φ are invariant. The Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Im}\Bigg[\mathrm{Tr}\int d^4\theta\left(M_i^\dagger e^V M^i + \tilde{M}^{\dagger i} e^V \tilde{M}_i + \Phi^\dagger e^V \Phi\right) \\ + \frac{\tau}{2}\int d^2\theta \mathrm{Tr} W^2 + i\int d^2\theta \mathcal{W}\Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the superpotential is

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathrm{Tr}\tilde{M}^i[\Phi, M_i] \ . \tag{2.4}$$

The scalar potential is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} = \mathrm{Tr}\Big[[m_i, m^{\dagger i}]^2 + [\tilde{m}^i, \tilde{m}_i^\dagger]^2 + [\phi, \phi^\dagger]^2 \\ + 2\left([m^{\dagger i}, \phi][\phi^\dagger, m_i] + [\tilde{m}_i^\dagger, \phi][\phi^\dagger, \tilde{m}^i] + [m_i, \tilde{m}^i][\tilde{m}_j^\dagger, m^{\dagger j}]\right)\Big] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Each of the summands is of the form $\mathrm{Tr}AA^\dagger$, thus each must vanish separately as the condition for a supersymmetric vacuum.

The moduli space of supersymmetric vacua contains a Coulomb branch, along which ϕ acquires an expectation value. From (2.5) this must satisfy $[\phi, \phi^\dagger] = 0$, which means it can be brought by a gauge transformation to the form $\phi = \mathrm{diag}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots, \phi_N)$ subject to the constraint $\sum \phi_i = 0$. The ϕ_i, i=1, ..., $N-1$ serve as coordinates on an S_N cover of the Coulomb branch, since the Weyl group acts by permuting the eigenvalues (leading to an action on the coordinates by the $(N-)$1-dimensional representation). At generic points along this the gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken to $U(1)^{N-1}$. The massless components of the matter hypermultiplets are the diagonal elements in this basis, as is

evident from (2.5). There are thus $g(N-1)$ neutral massless hypermultiplets. The Weyl group acts on these via the $(N-1)$-dimensional representation mentioned above. Since the moduli space is a quotient by the action of this group the factorization into hypermultiplet moduli $\times$ vector moduli will fail at the origin. This local quotient structure of the moduli space can be taken as the zeroth prediction from our model. In the remainder of this subsection we will use the identification of the singularity as a point of enhanced gauge symmetry to make additional predictions which will be verified in section three by a closer look at the geometry.

The first prediction is the existence of a Higgs branch. As in [15], the scalar potential allows the solitons to condense, and following the example there we anticipate that this will describe a generalization of the conifold transition to a distinct Calabi–Yau manifold. Along this branch the scalars in the hypermultiplets acquire expectation values, and at a generic point the gauge group is completely broken. The (quaternionic) dimension of the Higgs branch is predicted to be

$$\mathcal{H} = (g-1)(N^2-1) \ . \tag{2.6}$$

We can somewhat refine this prediction. There are special submanifolds on the Coulomb branch (meeting at the origin) along which nonabelian subgroups of $SU(N)$ are unbroken. These correspond exactly to fixed point sets of the S_N action, where eigenvalues of ϕ coincide. In general an unbroken symmetry

$$SU(k_1) \times \cdots \times SU(k_p) \times U(1)^{p-1} \tag{2.7}$$

where $\sum k_i = N$, $k_i \geq 1$ (and factors of $SU(1)$ are simply to be ignored) will occur in codimension $N-p$, and there will be g massless hypermultiplets in the adjoint representation of the unbroken group. We can allow these to acquire expectation values, breaking the nonabelian part completely and leading to a mixed branch with the Higgs component having dimension

$$(g-1)\sum_{i=1}^{p}(k_i^2-1) + g(p-1) \ . \tag{2.8}$$

We can also see the transition to the Higgs branch along a different path which will prove more transparent in the geometrical analysis. At a generic point on the Coulomb branch, we can turn on expectation values for the $g(N-1)$ neutral hypermultiplet scalars.

Then, as we tune ϕ to zero, the nonabelian symmetry is not restored, and the gauge symmetry remains $U(1)^{N-1}$, as in [15]. The theory is still IR free and we can use classical analysis. From (2.5) we see that the hypermultiplet expectation values lead to masses for the off-diagonal components with rank N^2-N (essentially there is a mass for the off-diagonal entries collinear in flavor space with the expectation value). Thus there are at the singular point an additional $(g-1)(N^2-N)$ charged hypermultiplets with the $U(1)^{N-1}$ charges of $g-1$ adjoints. When these acquire generic expectation values the gauge symmetry is Higgsed leading back to the Higgs branch dimension (2.6).

In codimension one (along components of the singular divisor) the unbroken symmetry is $SU(2)\times U(1)^{N-2}$. This locus is fixed by a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of S_N and in terms of an invariant transverse coordinate u we can predict from the one-loop beta function a logarithmic term in the effective action. Since the metric on moduli space is given by two derivatives of a holomorphic prepotential both in the gauge theory [28] and in the conformal field theory [29] (but note that here we are going to neglect gravitational effects and use the form of the Kähler potential appropriate to global supersymmetry, see [30]) we identify the singular terms of these. In both theories the prepotential is given by identical expressions in terms of a symplectic basis of periods. In the gauge theory case these are the periods of an elliptic curve constructed as in [30], while in the conformal field theory they are the periods of the holomorphic three-form on W. Our second prediction is thus that two of the periods of W will be given in the vicinity of the singular point by the (one-loop) expressions for the periods of the elliptic curve

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \sqrt{2u} + \dots \\ a_D &= i\frac{2-2g}{\pi} a \log a. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

In other words, we predict that there should be a two-dimensional subspace of shrinking cycles, and under $u \to e^{2\pi i} u$ the monodromy in this subspace should be given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_D \\ a \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2(g-1) \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_D \\ a \end{pmatrix} . \tag{2.10}$$

The second of (2.9) exhibits the logarithmic corrections to the monopole masses, vanishing for g=1, which were discussed above.

Using the results of [31] we can extend our predictions to subleading order in the string coupling of the type II theory. This is because there is a topological (hence computable) one-loop amplitude which appears as the coefficient of a particular term in the spacetime

effective action. As Vafa showed, the singular behavior of this coefficient near a singularity associated with the existence of new massless particle states is given by

$$F_1^{\rm top} \sim -\frac{1}{12}\sum (-)^{s(i)} \log \mu_i^2 \tag{2.11}$$

where the sum extends over BPS states with mass μ_i becoming massless at the singularity and $s(i)$ is zero for hypermultiplets and one for vector multiplets. In the codimension-one case considered above, the masses of the charged states are easily seen from (2.5) to be $\mu = a$. (This follows in general from the central charge formula but in this IR free case the classical computation is sufficient.) There are $2g$ hypermultiplets of these, and 2 vector multiplets, so substituting (2.9) in (2.11) we have our third prediction

$$F_1^{\rm top} \sim -\frac{1}{12}(g-1)\log |u|^2 \ . \tag{2.12}$$

There are thus a number of detailed predictions that our model for the nature of the singularity makes regarding the geometrical data of W. In sections three and four we will see that these are in excellent agreement with geometrical calculations.

2.3. D-String Interpretation

Following recent discussions of string duality we can try to understand this model from a different point of view. It has been argued [6,12] that type IIA strings on a $K3$ manifold in the vicinity of an A_{N-1} singularity can be locally described by type IIB strings with N coalescing NS-NS fivebranes. These are localized at the singular points so their worldvolumes fill spacetime. The coalescing fivebranes lead to enhanced gauge symmetry on their worldvolume. (This was found for D-branes in [32], and [12] noted that this is S-dual to the situation at hand. In the NS-NS case the string configurations responsible for the enhanced gauge symmetry were described in [33].) The worldvolume fills spacetime, so we observe enhanced gauge symmetry in the six-dimensional effective theory.

This model of degenerating surfaces is a bit subtle, so it is worthwhile pausing here to review and clarify the argument. This is most directly done along the lines of [34]. A $K3$ surface can be constructed as an elliptic fibration, i.e. as a compactification of the total space of a T^2 bundle over S^2, provided that the moduli of the $K3$ are suitably restricted.[7]

[7] If we assume that the elliptic fibration admits a section, then these restricted moduli comprise 18 complex-structure moduli and 2 Kähler moduli, the latter being the sizes of the base and the fiber. This is one of the moduli spaces of CFT's on algebraic $K3$ surfaces discussed in [35].

Generically, the fiber is degenerate over 24 points on the base. We can understand this construction as a type IIA string vacuum as follows. In compactifying on T^2 the theory has a modulus τ describing the complex structure of T^2. In an adiabatic approximation, we can obtain solutions to the vacuum equations by letting τ vary slowly in spacetime (keeping the metric and the B-field fixed). This can lead to interesting solutions if we then allow τ to have $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})$ monodromy about some submanifolds in codimension two. These solutions were called "stringy cosmic strings" in [34], but they differ from conventional cosmic strings in that there is a vacuum solution even inside the core. Since the transverse space is four-dimensional they are more properly described as fivebranes. It is important to note that the (coordinate) singularity occurs at a particular point in the fiber (where the torus is pinched) and thus if we excise this point the boundary of the resulting space is topologically S^3. Near the core, of course, the adiabatic approximation fails, but in at least one case there is an exact solution reducing to it far from the core. This is the case in which we have 24 singularities on S^2, with monodromies conjugate to $T : \tau \to \tau + 1$ about each. This can be completed by the hyper-Kähler metric on $K3$ which approximates the metric we discuss far from the singularities, and extends across the singular fibers with no singularity in the total space. Of course, the product of the monodromies about the 24 singularities is the identity.

Singular points in the moduli space can be modeled in this representation by letting the special points on S^2 approach each other. When N of the singularities coincide the $K3$ manifold acquires an A_{N-1} singularity.[8] It is important to note that the monodromies about the N special points that coalesce to form an A_{N-1} singularity all commute, hence can simultaneously be chosen as T.

The conformal field theory of compactification on a torus is invariant under the exchange of τ and the Kähler modulus $\rho = B + i\sqrt{G}$, if we simultaneously replace the type IIA theory by type IIB. (This is mirror symmetry on the torus.) In the adiabatic approximation we can thus replace a slowly-varying τ at constant ρ, with slowly-varying ρ at constant τ. The singular fibers can now be taken (up to $SL(2,\mathbf{Z})$ transformations) to be points of decompactification where the two-volume of T^2 diverges. In this case the monodromy is $T : B \to B + 1$ suggesting the presence of a magnetic source of H-charge

[8] The attentive reader will wonder why A_1 singularities seem to arise in complex codimension one, and why the famous B-field [5,6] has not been mentioned. The reason is that we are working in a twenty-dimensional complex slice of the full quaternionic moduli space.

[19]. Such sources are known from a semiclassical solution, and there is a known conformal field theory—the symmetric fivebrane (see [36])—which appears to give the exact solution which is approximated by that semiclassical one. It has been conjectured [6,19] that the singularity in the model with slowly-varying ρ can be repaired by replacing a small neighborhood of the singularity with the fivebrane solution.

There are two important subtleties in this case of slowly-varying ρ. The first concerns the topology of the singularity. Whereas in the previous description the (coordinate) singularity in the theory was concentrated at a single point, in this description in order to obtain a smooth manifold we must excise the entire noncompact fiber, leading to a boundary with the topology of $S^1 \times T^2$ (see [19]). The second subtlety in this case is that the monodromies about different singularities on S^2 do not commute. Thus while locally near each singularity we can always make a choice of ρ for which the monodromy is T, this is not possible globally. This means that if we attempted to perform this construction over all of S^2 at once, then about some points we would find that the two-volume of the torus is not a single valued function of the parameter! Such behavior is certainly not compatible with a description in terms of a smooth hyper-Kähler manifold. In the previous IIA description of this theory as a "τ-string", the local hyper-Kähler manifolds near singular fibers were glued together using transition functions which involve diffeomorphisms of T^2. In the present IIB "ρ-string" description, however, the conformal field theories must be attached by some kind of generalized transition function which involves a nonlocal transformation implementing the nontrivial elements in $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ which act on ρ. Thus while one can imagine patching together conformal field theories in an adiabatic approximation we do not find a sigma model interpretation of the overall theory. However, since in the semiclassical approximation it is isomorphic to the τ-string for which an exact solution is known, this unusual construction should also lead to an exact string vacuum.

About the second point raised above we have little to add. We will primarily be interested in using this construction as a local model for N special fibers coalescing to the ρ-string analogue of an A_{N-1} singularity, and in that context the issue is irrelevant because the monodromies about the singular points which coincide at the singularity all commute.

The first point is of greater concern, however, since we would like the boundary of the singular set we remove to be S^3 so that the singularity can be repaired by plumbing in the symmetric fivebrane. This can be achieved by considering the decompactified singular fiber as a punctured complex plane. We note that the B-fields on the fibers can be chosen to have

compact support on T^2 in the vicinity of the singular fiber, approximating a δ-function as we approach the origin, such that on the decompactified central fiber the limiting B-field vanishes away from the excised origin. (Such a construction is suggested by the fact that the fiberwise-integrated B-field behaves as $\arg z$ for z near 0 in the complex plane.) In this situation we now have a singularity in codimension four rather than codimension two. Note that because of the choice of B-field the computation of H-flux through $S^1 \times T^2$ from [19] can be deformed to find an identical flux through an S^3 surrounding the point singularity, predicting the presence of a source of magnetic H-charge at the point we removed.

It is natural to conjecture as in [6,19] that this source is the symmetric fivebrane. In practice, this means that we can cut out a small ball around the singularity and replace it with a (suitably scaled) fivebrane solution. The worldvolume of this fivebrane comprises all of six-dimensional spacetime, so worldvolume dynamics will appear as spacetime dynamics in the string theory. Note that this description of the singularity, and hence of the completion as well, works locally where we have chosen ρ so that the singular fiber is decompactified (as above). It is not clear how to describe this with a different choice, i.e., after applying a nonlocal transformation implementing an $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ shift of ρ.

As a final step, following [12], since we are now dealing with IIB strings we can if we wish use S-duality to relate this situation to an equivalent type IIB theory of D-strings, replacing the symmetric fivebranes charged under the NS-NS field H with D-fivebranes charged under the R-R field H'.

The points of enhanced $SU(N)$ gauge symmetry are now described as points where N of these fivebranes coincide. Because the monodromies of the coalescing singularities commute we have a consistent manifold-like description of a neighborhood of the singularity. The new massless states are interpreted as open string states with ends on two different solitons. (This is in the D-string picture; for NS-NS fivebranes these are closed string states which close "down the throat" [33]). The worldvolume dynamics was described in [32], and contains a dimensional reduction (to six dimensions) of ten-dimensional supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory. The spectrum of light states near the singularity is thus precisely the six-dimensional spectrum of subsection *2.1*, i.e. we have vector multiplets of $\mathcal{N}$=(1, 1) supersymmetry in six dimensions with gauge group $SU(N)$.

The picture we have reviewed above can be used to describe the dynamics that leads to enhanced gauge symmetry in $K3$ compactification of the IIA string. However, that is not the problem we wish to address here. We have claimed that locally about a generic point in C the structure of the transverse space is identical to the local neighborhood

of an A_{N-1} singularity on $K3$. This should allow us to apply the description above to the A_{N-1} singularity transverse to C, replacing it (in a dual model of the unusual form discussed above) with N coincident fivebranes. As in the discussion above, the worldvolume dynamics of these is given by a six-dimensional theory obtained by dimensional reduction of ten-dimensional super Yang–Mills theory. This is precisely the model studied in subsection *2.1.* The worldvolume of these would now be of the form $C \times \mathbf{R}^4$, and our problem would be mapped to that of describing the propagation of solitons wrapped about such a curved surface.[9]

In order to carry out this construction, we would need something more than a local neighborhood of C in the Calabi–Yau space: we would need what might be called a *semilocal* neighborhood U of C which contains entire T^2 fibers (since we cannot apply the nonlocal $\tau \leftrightarrow \rho$ transformation without the entire T^2.) Such neighborhoods will not always exist. When they do, though, each point in U lies in a unique T^2 (or a degenerate limiting fiber) so there is a well-defined map from U to the parameter space S for the T^2 fibers (and their limits). The curve C of singularities maps to a complex curve in S which we identify with C, and S is a small neighborhood of C. Some care must be taken in interpreting this family of T^2's, since the j-invariant, which should be a map from S to $\mathbf{P}^1$, fails to be well-defined at some points P_j on C. (The typical behavior is that S has local complex coordinates s_1, s_2, near such a point, and the j-invariant is locally given by s_1/s_2.)

Over $S - C$, we get a fibration by T^2's and can pass from the τ-string picture to the ρ-string picture as above (moving to a IIB theory). Away from the points P_j, we can then complete the ρ-string by including a symmetric fivebrane as discussed earlier. However, the behavior at the points P_j is somewhat mysterious.[10] We hope to return to this question in future work. Assuming that the behavior at such points is OK, the soliton indeed propagates on $C \times \mathbf{R}^4$ as claimed above.

---

[9] There is a difficulty here; the fivebranes have a tension, which would seem to imply that a C of finite size is not a solution of the equations of motion. We thank N. Seiberg for pointing this out to us. A more precise statement of this problem would involve consistency criteria along the lines of [37]. Such criteria are not known for curved worldvolumes. The twisting described above, to which we return shortly, may resolve this difficulty.

[10] Note that to carry out the construction as we have given it we could actually have started with a bit less: we need a neighborhood of $C - \{P_j\}$ rather than all of S. (Such a neighborhood would be obtained from S by removing a collection of disks through the P_j's, transverse to C.)

Some progress towards a description of soliton propagation in curved spacetimes was made in [20], where it was noted that the worldvolume theory would be twisted. The essential point of the argument there was that the scalars in the worldvolume supermultiplets represent transverse motion of the D-brane, and thus should properly take their values in a "normal bundle" which encodes the transverse motion. When the D-brane wraps around a non-flat cycle, the "scalars" will thus become sections of a nontrivial bundle over this cycle. That is precisely the situation we have here. The relevant scalars are the four components of ϕ in (2.1), which now become sections of the four-dimensional normal bundle to C encoding the transverse motion. Two of the transverse directions of the D-brane lie in the decompactified torus, and the "normal bundle" in those directions will be trivial. The other two transverse directions, though, are best described by means of the ordinary normal bundle of C within the parameter space S (a complex bundle of rank one), which can be calculated to be[11]

$$N_{C/S} = \mathcal{K}_C \ , \tag{2.13}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_C$ is the canonical bundle of the complex curve C. We will verify this below.

Thus, the "normal bundle" to our D-brane worldvolume is described as a complex bundle of rank two[12]

$$N_{D-brane} = \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}} \ , \tag{2.14}$$

where $\mathcal{O}$ represents a trivial bundle of complex rank 1. The four scalars must thus split, two remaining as scalars (a complex section of $\mathcal{O}$) and two one-forms (sections of $\mathcal{K}$ and its conjugate). This uniquely determines the twist (2.2). This gives us in four dimensions the model obtained previously, now interpreted as the worldvolume theory.

The explicit construction we have used to find the dual description of the singularity is, as we have seen, of limited validity (because we require the existence of a suitable U). It is not clear whether a more general argument can be made, or whether the description in terms of parallel D-branes is itself limited. The fact that our predictions for the low-energy physics are in agreement with those of subsection *2.1* suggests that the former is true, and that U is only needed to guarantee the existence of an adiabatic region. In the next section we will verify these predictions using geometrical methods.

[11] The calculation is made in the IIA τ-string picture, but the result is independent of whether we are using the τ-string or the ρ-string model.

[12] The bundle splits as a C^∞ direct sum, not necessarily a holomorphic one.

Appendix to Section 2: Verification of Eq. (2.13)

We resolve the singularity along C with a family of ALE spaces, obtaining exceptional divisors $E_1, \ldots, E_{N-1}$ as described earlier. Let U be the semilocal neighborhood which maps to the parameter space S, and let $\pi : U \to S$ denote the mapping. Then $\pi^{-1}(C)$ consists of $E_1 \cup \ldots \cup E_{N-1}$, together with one more component E_0 which meets both E_1 and E_{N-1}. (The fiber over a general point of C consists of n rational curves arranged in a cycle, which is one form of "degenerate limiting T^2" in the classification given by Kodaira [38].) If we pull back the normal bundle of C in S by the map π, we obtain the normal bundle of E in U, where $E = \pi^{-1}(C) = E_0 + E_1 + \ldots + E_{N-1}$. This can be computed with the aid of the adjunction formula, using the fact that the canonical bundle of U is trivial.

Working with the individual components E_i, we find that along E_i, $N_{E/U}$ takes the form

$$E|_{E_i} = (E_{i-1} \cap E_i) + (E_i \cap E_{i+1}) + N_{E_i/U} \tag{2.15}$$

(working with i modulo N). On the other hand, by the adjunction formula (from U to E_i)

$$\mathcal{K}_{E_i} = \mathcal{K}_U|_{E_i} + N_{E_i/U} = N_{E_i/U}. \tag{2.16}$$

We can write this in the form

$$\mathcal{K}_{E_i} = -(E_{i-1} \cap E_i) - (E_i \cap E_{i+1}) + \mathcal{L} \tag{2.17}$$

for some unknown line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on E_i, which must in fact be a pullback from C (since the first two terms in (2.17) take care of the canonical bundle of the fiber). Since the two curves $(E_{i\pm1} \cap E_i)$ are disjoint and isomorphic to C, if we use adjunction from E_i onto these curves we find

$$\mathcal{K}_C = \mathcal{K}_{E_{i\pm1} \cap E_i} = \mathcal{K}_{E_i}|_{E_{i\pm1} \cap E_i} + (E_{i\pm1} \cap E_i)^2 = \mathcal{L}|_{E_{i\pm1} \cap E_i}. \tag{2.18}$$

It follows that $\mathcal{L} = \pi^*(\mathcal{K}_C)$.

Since this happens on each E_i, we see that $N_{E/U} = \pi^*(\mathcal{K}_C)$, and so $N_{C/S} = \mathcal{K}_C$, verifying (2.13).

3. Geometry of the Moduli Space

In this section, we describe the geometry of the moduli space, find the extremal transition corresponding to the Higgs branch, and verify the predictions we have made concerning the structure of the moduli space, the monodromy of the periods, and the topological one-loop amplitude F_1.

3.1. The Vector Multiplet Moduli Space

To compute the vector multiplet moduli space, we represent our singularity on a Calabi–Yau hypersurface M in a toric variety V.[13] We follow the description given by Batyrev [39] of such hypersurfaces in terms of a *reflexive polyhedron* Δ, which specifies the monomials occurring in the equation of M. The polar polyhedron Δ° is also reflexive. The Calabi–Yau hypersurface will have a singularity as described above precisely when Δ° has an edge joining two vertices $v_0,\ v_N$ of Δ° with $N-1$ equally spaced lattice points $v_1,\ldots,v_{N-1}$ in the interior of the edge. It is assumed that $N \geq 2$. The Calabi–Yau threefold M is a hypersurface in the toric variety whose fan is a suitable refinement of the fan consisting of the cones over the faces of Δ°. In particular, there are edges corresponding to the lattice points $v_1,\ldots,v_{N-1}$. These correspond to toric divisors, which resolve a surface S of A_{N-1} singularities in V. Restricting to the hypersurface M, we see that there are $N-1$ divisors in M which resolve a curve C of A_{N-1} singularities.

The genus g of C can be easily determined by toric geometry. By duality, the edge $D_1^* = \langle v_0, v_N\rangle$ determines a two-dimensional face Δ_2 of Δ. The number of integral interior points of Δ_2 is equal to the genus g.

The mirror manifold W is constructed [39] as a hypersurface in a toric variety Λ. Its defining equation is a sum of monomials corresponding to the integral points of Δ°. By our assumptions, there will be an edge with integral interior points. The linear equations

$$2v_k = v_{k-1} + v_{k+1} \tag{3.1}$$

for $k = 1,\ldots,N-1$ translate into relations on the monomials m_i associated to these v_i,

$$m_{k-1}m_{k+1} = m_k^2\ . \tag{3.2}$$

If the coefficient of m_i in the defining equation is denoted a_i then (3.2) shows that W is singular on the components of the divisor in moduli space given by the vanishing of the discriminant of the degree N polynomial

$$a_0x^N + a_1x^{N-1}y + \ldots + a_Ny^N \tag{3.3}$$

in two auxiliary variables (x,y).

[13] Both the geometry and the physics that we are describing will only depend on a small neighborhood of the singular curve; the use of toric geometry is a technical convenience for analyzing this neighborhood. For a review of toric geometry, see [25].

3.2. The Type IIB Description

This structure leads to a subtlety in the description of the moduli space of the conformal field theory near the singularity. At a smooth point the moduli space factors as a product of the space of complex structure deformations and the space of (complexified) Kähler deformations. Near the singularity this factorization fails,[14] for the following reason. There are toric divisors V_i in Λ associated to the g interior points of the face Δ_2, and when restricted to V_i the equation for W becomes *precisely* $a_0 m_0 + a_1 m_1 + \ldots + a_N m_N$. (One can think of this heuristically as a result of considering the V_i as exceptional divisors resolving a quotient singularity in the ambient space which coincides with the singularity of W.) Generically the restriction has N components. As usual, this leads to g sets of $N-1$ non-toric divisor classes on W. Along the discriminant divisor discussed above, these coalesce; at a generic point one component acquires multiplicity 2 along each V_i. The divisor classes thus undergo S_N monodromy about the components of the singular divisor. Because the "sum" of each N components is the toric divisor, the non-toric classes transform naturally in the $(N-1)$-dimensional representation.

Thus, the discriminant locus has a natural stratification indexed by partitions of $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ into subsets describing the coalescing of the roots of (3.3). The minimal stratum occurs where (3.3) is a perfect N^{th} power of a linear monomial which we will denote as z. The g interior integral points of Δ_2 give some of the homogeneous coordinates of the toric variety. We will denote these as $x_1, \ldots x_g$. The hypersurface W is defined by an linear combination of monomials corresponding to integral points of Δ°. The points of D_1^* correspond to the only monomials which do not involve the variables $x_1 \ldots, x_g$. At the minimal stratum, the combination of these monomials is precisely z^N. Thus the equation of W is of the form

$$z^N = x_1 \cdots x_g f \tag{3.4}$$

where f depends on the choice of complex structure. Putting $y_i = x_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq g$ and $y_{g+1} = f$, we see from (3.4) that the singular locus of W is the union of the curves $z = y_i = y_j = 0$ for each pair of indices (i, j) with $i \neq j$.[15] It is important that (3.4) is

[14] This was independently noted in [12].

[15] In [40], the example $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,2)}[8]$ was considered, and the singularity we are discussing here was described there as being isolated. However, the model used in [40] must be blown up further in order to be able to realize generic Kähler structures, and we again reach the description just given of the curve of singularities.

written in homogeneous coordinates on Λ, subject to the restrictions on intersections of coordinate hyperplanes that follow from the toric structure.

We can also write down a local equation for the general deformation. It is clear that this is done by deforming the left-hand side of (3.4) to a generic polynomial of degree N in z. The coefficients of this are some functions x such that the deformed equation is still quasihomogeneous. Choosing a representative f_j in each relevant degree we can write the deformation as

$$z^N + \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} u_j f_j = x_1 \cdots x_g f \ . \tag{3.5}$$

The coefficients u_j give local coordinates on the deformation space. The moduli space of Kähler structures is a nontrivial S_N bundle over this, as noted above. To obtain a product structure we pass to an S_N cover, introducing coordinates $(z_1, \ldots, z_N)$ satisfying the constraint $\sum_i z_i = 0$, such that the u_j is the symmetric polynomials of degree j in z_i (the constraint simply reflects $u_{N-1} = 0$). With the same notation as above, we write the equation as

$$\prod_{i=1}^{N} (z - z_i h_i) = x_1 \cdots x_g f \tag{3.6}$$

for some other functions h_i. The z_i are the direct analogs of the ϕ_i of the previous section.

To reiterate: once we have passed to an appropriate S_N cover of the complex structure moduli space, the moduli space of conformal field theories splits as a product of the complex structure moduli and the Kähler moduli. The group S_N acts on this, with nontrivial action on both factors in the product, and the moduli space of CFTs is the quotient of the product by this group action.

One signal of this subtle structure is the behavior of the periods of the holomorphic 3-form. (In fact, this is how we originally discovered this phenomenon.[16]) The periods which are related to coordinates on this subspace of the moduli space can be calculated with the aid of the generalized hypergeometric differential equations of Gel'fand, Zelevinskiĭ and Kapranov [42]. These periods have a monodromy near the discriminant locus which reproduces the S_N cover. The combinatorics governing the differential equations

[16] A similar discovery—of a double cover of the moduli space in an example with $N = 2$—was made independently in [41], based upon an analysis of the heterotic weak-coupling enhanced gauge symmetry point.

are precisely given by (3.1); in the case of $N = 2$ these equations were solved in [43]. The general solution can be written as[17]

$$C_1 + C_2 \log\left(\frac{1 - 2t - \sqrt{1-4t}}{2t}\right) \tag{3.7}$$

(with C_1 and C_2 being constants of integration), although the structure we are interested in is more visible if we exploit the identity

$$\log\left(\frac{1 - 2t + \sqrt{1-4t}}{t}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1 - 2t - \sqrt{1-4t}}{t}\right) = \log 4 \tag{3.8}$$

to rewrite (3.7) as

$$C_1' \log\left(\frac{1 - 2t + \sqrt{1-4t}}{t}\right) + C_2' \log\left(\frac{1 - 2t - \sqrt{1-4t}}{t}\right) \ . \tag{3.9}$$

The discriminant is located at $t = 1/4$, and if we analytically continue around that point, the S_2 action is manifest.

The generalization to arbitrary N can be done with the methods of [43], but it is simpler to see the monodromy of the periods from the IIA perspective, to which we turn next.

3.3. The Type IIA Description

There is an analogous subtlety using the mirror description of the theory via the IIA string on M. This is automatic due to mirror symmetry, but it will prove useful to go through this in some detail.

Here the vector moduli space consists of the complexified Kähler classes of M. To see the non-product structure, though, we need to enlarge the Kähler moduli space. (We know from mirror symmetry that such enlargements are often necessary [25].)

Let us consider a general situation in which the Kähler cone $\mathcal{K}_M \subset H^2(M)$ has a codimension one face of the form $\mathcal{K}_M \cap \Gamma^\perp$, where $\Gamma \in H^2(M)$ is the class of a holomorphic 2-sphere. The topological 3-point functions for the conformal field theory take the general form

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \mathcal{O}_C \rangle = A \cdot B \cdot C + \sum_{\eta \in H_2(M)} \frac{q^\eta}{1 - q^\eta} N_\eta \, (A \cdot \eta)(B \cdot \eta)(C \cdot \eta) \tag{3.10}$$

[17] We are using a coordinate $t = a_0 a_2 / a_1^2$ which differs from the one used in [43] by a factor of 4.

for $A, B, C \in H^2(M)$, where N_η counts the number of holomorphic 2-spheres of class η (in the generalized sense of "Gromov–Witten invariants"), where q^η denotes $\prod q_i^{(E_i \cdot \eta)}$ once a basis $\{E_i\}$ for $H^2(M)$ has been chosen, and where we have incorporated the "multiple cover formula" of [44,45]. The analytic continuation of this expression to the other side of the wall $\Gamma^\perp$ can be computed using the identity

$$\frac{q^\Gamma}{1-q^\Gamma} = -1 - \frac{q^{-\Gamma}}{1-q^{-\Gamma}}, \tag{3.11}$$

which results in an expression of the form[18]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_A \mathcal{O}_B \mathcal{O}_C \rangle = & (A \cdot B \cdot C - N_\Gamma \, (A \cdot \Gamma)(B \cdot \Gamma)(C \cdot \Gamma)) \\ & + \frac{q^{-\Gamma}}{1-q^{-\Gamma}} \, N_\Gamma \, (A \cdot (-\Gamma))(B \cdot (-\Gamma))(C \cdot (-\Gamma)) \\ & + \sum_{\eta \in H_2(M), \eta \neq \Gamma} \frac{q^\eta}{1-q^\eta} \, N_\eta \, (A \cdot \eta)(B \cdot \eta)(C \cdot \eta) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Suppose that we have another Calabi–Yau manifold $\widehat{M}$ and an isomorphism $\rho : H^2(M) \to H^2(\widehat{M})$ such that the instanton numbers N_η are preserved, and such that the cones $\mathcal{K}_M$ and $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_{\widehat{M}})$ meet along their common wall $\Gamma^\perp$. If

$$\rho(A) \cdot \rho(B) \cdot \rho(C) = A \cdot B \cdot C - N_\Gamma \, (A \cdot \Gamma)(B \cdot \Gamma)(C \cdot \Gamma), \tag{3.13}$$

then (3.12) shows that the sigma model on $\widehat{M}$ provides an analytic continuation of the sigma model on M across the wall $\Gamma^\perp$.

Perhaps the most familiar instance of this construction is the case of a flop, where this was worked out in [24,43] (see also [46] for more details). If there are a finite number N_Γ of curves in the class Γ, then flopping them all produces the Calabi–Yau manifold $\widehat{M}$ and the map ρ is the "proper transform" of divisors. (Eq. (3.13) was verified for this case in [46].) From this calculation we learn that the cones $\mathcal{K}_M$ and $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_{\widehat{M}})$ can be attached along their common face to form a moduli space of a single class of conformal field theories with two different phase regions (corresponding to sigma models on different Calabi–Yau manifolds). There is an obvious extension of this to the union of the Kähler cones of all possible flops of M (transported back to $H^2(M)$ as $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_{\widehat{M}})$) which forms the *partially*

[18] Note that the location of the singularity in the three-point functions asymptotically approaches $q^\Gamma = 1$ when we tune the other parameters so as to suppress all other instanton contributions [43].

enlarged Kähler moduli space of [25]. (The corresponding cone is known as the *movable cone*.)

A less familiar instance of the same construction is the case of an *elementary transformation*.[19] Such a transformation exists whenever the class Γ is represented by a family of holomorphic 2-spheres which sweep out a divisor E. (This divisor is contracted to a curve of genus g when the area of the 2-spheres goes to zero.) To define the elementary transformation we take $\widehat{M} = M$ and define the isomorphism ρ by

$$\rho(H) = H + (H \cdot \Gamma)E. \tag{3.14}$$

Since $E \cdot \Gamma = -2$, this is a *reflection*, i.e., $\rho(E) = -E$.

To verify eq. (3.13) for an elementary transformation requires a bit of work. Since $E^2 = K_E$ by the adjunction formula, we have $E^3 = (K_E \cdot K_E)_E = 8 - 8g$. Furthermore, denoting by Γ a divisor class on M whose restriction to E is Γ, we have $(A|_E \cdot \Gamma)_E = A \cdot \Gamma$ and $(E|_E \cdot \Gamma)_E = (K_E \cdot \Gamma)_E = -2$, so the combination $\frac{1}{(A\cdot\Gamma)} A \cdot E + \frac{1}{2}E^2$ is a cycle on M which lies on E and which has intersection number 0 with Γ; it is therefore numerically equivalent to $a\Gamma$ for some a. Similarly, there are numerical equivalences

$$\frac{1}{(B \cdot \Gamma)} B \cdot E + \frac{1}{2}E^2 \equiv b\Gamma, \qquad \frac{1}{(C \cdot \Gamma)} C \cdot E + \frac{1}{2}E^2 \equiv c\Gamma. \tag{3.15}$$

We now compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(A \cdot \Gamma)} A \cdot E^2 &= -\frac{1}{2}E^3 + a(E \cdot \Gamma) = (4g-4) - 2a; \\ \frac{1}{(A \cdot \Gamma)(B \cdot \Gamma)} A \cdot B \cdot E &= -\frac{1}{2(B \cdot \Gamma)} B \cdot E^2 + \frac{a}{(B \cdot \Gamma)}(B \cdot \Gamma) = (2-2g) + b + a. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\rho(A) \cdot \rho(B) \cdot \rho(C) - A \cdot B \cdot C}{(A \cdot \Gamma)(B \cdot \Gamma)(C \cdot \Gamma)} \\ &\qquad = \frac{(A + (A \cdot \Gamma)E) \cdot (B + (B \cdot \Gamma)E) \cdot (C + (C \cdot \Gamma)E) - A \cdot B \cdot C}{(A \cdot \Gamma)(B \cdot \Gamma)(C \cdot \Gamma)} \\ &\qquad = (2 - 2g + b + a) + (2 - 2g + c + a) + (2 - 2g + c + b) \\ &\qquad\quad + (4g - 4 - 2a) + (4g - 4 - 2b) + (4g - 4 - 2c) + (8 - 8g) \\ &\qquad = (2 - 2g) \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

[19] Elementary transformations were first discussed for $K3$ surfaces in [47] and for Calabi–Yau threefolds in [48] in the case of $g = 1$; elementary transformations over curves of arbitrary genus were discussed in section 9 of [40], and section 6 of [46], but not in much detail in either place.

This agrees with (3.13) since we know that $N_\Gamma = 2g-2$ as explained in [40] (see also the next subsection).

The interpretation of the elementary transformation is a bit different than that of the flop. The analytic continuation of the conformal field theory from the cone $\mathcal{K}_M$ to the cone $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_M)$ produces a theory which, by virtue of the elementary transformation ρ, is isomorphic to the sigma model on M, but which uses a different basis for $H^2(M)$. We can enlarge the moduli space further to include these reflected cones $\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{K}_M)$, but since we are obtaining identical theories we should then mod out by the action of the reflection. This would appear to be a trivial operation were it not for the fact that when we vary the complex structure, the cones involved can change and the elementary transformation can cease to exist.

More precisely, what happens is this: if $g\geq 1$, the complex structure can be deformed so that the class Γ is represented by only finitely many holomorphic 2-spheres ($2g-2$ of them, to be precise). In the case of $g=1$, the Kähler cone also changes: the generic Kähler cone is the union of the cones which appeared at special complex structure. In the case of $g>1$ it is the movable cone which changes: the various cones are still glued together, but at generic complex structure they represent Calabi–Yau manifolds related to each other by flopping.

The flops, in this case of a perturbed elementary transformation, actually take the Calabi–Yau manifold to another Calabi–Yau manifold of the same type, *but with a different complex structure and different Kähler class.* Thus, the elementary transformation ρ actually acts on the entire moduli space, moving from point to point, identifying Calabi–Yau's which differ by a flop. (These identifications change both the complex and the Kähler structures simultaneously.) The transformation ρ fixes a subset of the complex structures—the ones for which the divisor E exists—and on that fixed locus it acts as the elementary transformation described above.

It is now clear how S_N acts in this situation, when there is a curve of A_{N-1} singularities. We first observe that the $N-1$ elementary transformations associated to the $N-1$ exceptional divisors generate the group S_N. This gives an S_N action on the complex moduli space. On the part of the moduli space which is transverse to the locus where the E_i's exist, we expect this representation to be a sum of g distinct $(N-1)$-dimensional representations according to our discussion of the IIB string on W. This assertion will be verified directly later using deformation theory.

The S_N action on the complex structure moduli space must be coupled to its action on the enlarged Kähler moduli space. In fact, the "reflected movable cone" [46], which is the union of all translates of the Kähler cone under all possible flops and reflections, is now invariant under deformation of complex structure, and is acted upon by the S_N action according to (3.14). This is our other $(N-1)$-dimensional representation of S_N. Our descriptions now agree for the IIA and IIB models: in each case, we have a product of complex structure and Kähler moduli, with an action of S_N on each factor, and we take the quotient of that product by the combined action to obtain the correct CFT moduli space.

3.4. Geometry of the Extremal Transitions

In the remainder of this section, we consider the extremal transitions and show several ways in which the transitions are in perfect agreement with the gauge theoretic predictions. First, let us quickly clarify our meaning of an extremal transition, following [49]. This class of transitions generalizes the notion of a conifold transition. We start with a Calabi-Yau threefold M which admits a birational contraction $M \to N$ to a singular threefold N. If N can be deformed to a smooth Calabi-Yau threefold N', then the transition from M to N' is called an extremal transition. Recent progress in understanding when N is smoothable has been made in [50–52].

Our first prediction from the gauge theory is the existence of a Higgs branch, which should correspond to an extremal transition from M to another Calabi–Yau manifold N' whose Hodge numbers are such as to produce a moduli space with dimension in accordance with (2.6). It is easiest to see the transition geometrically in the IIA description. Here, we reach the transition by contracting all exceptional divisors to our curve C of A_{N-1} singularities (with an appropriate value of the B-field). It was shown recently that this singular threefold deforms to a smooth Calabi–Yau threefold [52]. This is the desired transition. It would be very desirable to be able to see the transition in the IIB description.

To compute the change in Hodge numbers associated to this transition (for comparison to (2.6)) it proves most efficient to proceed along the alternate path mentioned in subsection *2.2* which avoids the point of enhanced gauge symmetry. In effect, these examples now give us conifold transitions in type IIA string theory, and this will allow us to calculate the dimensions of the moduli spaces and show that they agree with our gauge theoretic predictions. From the point of view of the gauge theory these transitions are identical to

those obtained in [15], but we will describe them here in the language appropriate to type IIA strings, whereas the discussion in [15] was in terms of type IIB string theory.[20]

We claim that after we effect a general non-toric deformation, the exceptional divisors E_i are replaced with $\binom{N}{2}$ collections of $2g-2$ homologous 2 spheres. These 2 spheres can then be used to give a conifold transition.

In a little more generality, suppose that we have a Calabi–Yau threefold obtained by resolving a genus g curve of A_{N-1} singularities in a singular Calabi–Yau threefold. The exceptional divisors form a chain of $N-1$ irreducible ruled surfaces over this curve of genus g, which we order consecutively so that E_i meets E_{i+1}. In particular, this is the situation for the manifolds M that we are considering.

For any subset $\{j, j+1, \ldots, k-1, k\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, N-1\}$, we consider the fibers of $E_j \cup \cdots \cup E_k$. This is a family of chains of $\mathbf{P}^1$s parameterized by the singular curve C. Its deformation theory is controlled by its normal bundle since it is still a local complete intersection in the threefold. The tangent space to the deformation space is $H^0(\mathcal{N})$, which is then identified with the tangent space to C. The obstruction space is $H^1(\mathcal{N})$. The argument of [40] applies. We have a perfect pairing

$$H^0(\mathcal{N}) \otimes H^1(\mathcal{N}) \to H^1(\wedge^2 \mathcal{N}) \simeq H^1(\omega), \tag{3.18}$$

where ω is the canonical sheaf of our reducible curve. Note that $H^1(\omega)$ is one-dimensional. Furthermore, by duality, this pairing globalizes to a pairing of line bundles over C. The right side of the pairing globalizes to the trivial bundle. The space $H^1(\mathcal{N})$ globalizes to the obstruction bundle. The pairing now shows that the obstruction bundle is the cotangent bundle of C.

Returning for definiteness to our class of examples, i.e., the ones realized as toric hypersurfaces, it has been remarked earlier that there is a $g(N-1)$-dimensional space of non-toric deformations [39]. A general deformation induces a section of the obstruction bundle, which has $2g-2$ zeros corresponding to the fibers which will deform. In other words, a general (non-toric) deformation contains $\binom{N}{2}$ collections of $2g-2$ rational curves, one for each choice of j, k. This completes the justification of our claim.[21] This deformation should correspond to the region of moduli space discussed in subsection *2.1* following equation

[20] The transitions are identical provided that the mirror of a conifold transition is a conifold transition—something which was implicitly conjectured in [49,15].

[21] This was the argument used in [40] to establish that $N_\Gamma = 2g-2$.

(2.8), in which we make the transition to the Higgs branch avoiding the point of enhanced gauge symmetry. At first sight there is an apparent discrepancy in the two descriptions. In the gauge theory, we predict the existence of $g-1$ hypermultiplets with the charges under $U(1)^{N-1}$ of the adjoint representation. Here we find instead twice as many cycles with the charges of the positive roots (as mentioned, the neutral components are not solitonic in origin and are manifest). Of course, the discrepancy is only in appearance, because the adjoint representation is real. Thus considering a double set of hypermultiplets with only the positive charges is simply a reshuffling of the fields.

It is illuminating to consider this in more detail. The $g(N-1)$ complex structure deformations can be seen explicitly. For each of the exceptional divisors E_i, there is a map $H_1(C) \to H_3(M)$ given by sending a 1 cycle γ on C to the 3 cycle swept out by the fibers of E_i lying over γ [53]. This can be refined to a mapping $\phi_i : H^{1,0}(C) \to H^{2,1}(M)$. The images of the $N-1$ maps ϕ_i span the non-toric deformations. This geometrical discussion precisely reflects the dimensional reduction following (2.2); the hypermultiplets (complex structure deformations) are related to the same two-cycle Γ_i as the corresponding vector multiplets (the modulus dual to E_i), but are related to one of the g holomorphic one-forms on C.

Similarly, there are maps $\phi_{i,j} : H^{1,0}(C) \to H^{2,1}(M)$ defined using the reducible fibers of $E_i \cup \ldots \cup E_j$. The set of all such unions $E_i \cup \ldots \cup E_j$ for $i \leq j$ are naturally identified with the set of positive roots of the root system A_{N-1} by identifying it with the root $e_i - e_{j+1}$ in the notation of [54]. With this identification, the Weyl group of A_{N-1} is S_N and naturally acts on the space of non-toric deformations by exchanging the images of the $\phi_{i,j}$ as dictated by the corresponding Weyl group action on the abstract root system. These classes are not independent of those described in the previous paragraph, they give another (overcomplete) basis for the same space, which makes the S_N action manifest. It is clear from this description that we have g distinct $(N-1)$-dimensional representations, as was asserted in our earlier discussion. The discriminant locus in this context will occur for certain Kähler structures which contract one of the E_i (with a suitable shift by the B field), since some of the fibers in the above description will now coalesce. This again agrees with what we found using the IIB string on W.

As an alternative approach to understanding the structure of the non-toric deformations of M, we can start by considering deformations where the exceptional divisors deform to $2g-2$ chains of $N-1$ connected $\mathbf{P}^1$s. The general case can be inferred from the

deformation theory of these chains. Criteria for when a connected union of $\mathbf{P}^1$s can be deformed or contracted are considered in the doctoral thesis of T. Zerger [55].

There is a part of the boundary in the Kähler moduli space of M on which the area of each of the fibers of the E_i approach 0. Our transition will occur somewhere on here by supplying an appropriate value of the B-field. Remaining at this location in the Kähler moduli space and performing a general complex structure deformation as discussed above, we are in a situation where $(2g-2)\binom{N}{2}$ curves get contracted to nodes. These curves span a $(N-1)$-dimensional subspace of the homology of M (generated by the classes of the $N-1$ irreducible fibers).

Now smoothing these singularities, we claim that the Hodge numbers change by

$$h^{1,1} \mapsto h^{1,1} - (N-1), \quad h^{2,1} \mapsto h^{2,1} + (2g-2)\binom{N}{2} - (N-1). \tag{3.19}$$

To see this, note first that the drop of $N-1$ in $h^{1,1}$ is clear—the transition kills $N-1$ independent homology 2-cycles. Furthermore, the transition is obtained homotopically by replacing $(2g-2)\binom{N}{2}$ two spheres by $(2g-2)\binom{N}{2}$ three spheres. This results in a change of Euler characteristic by $-2(2g-2)\binom{N}{2}$. Since we have already accounted for $-2(N-1)$ two-dimensional and four-dimensional homology, there must be a net change of $2(2g-2)\binom{N}{2} - 2(N-1)$ in three-dimensional homology. These are shared equally by $H^{2,1}$ and $H^{1,2}$, giving the claimed result.

Note that the above argument more generally applies to describe the conifold transition in type IIA string theory. Suppose that R rational curves spanning an S-dimensional subspace of homology are contracted and then smoothed. We have

$$h^{1,1} \mapsto h^{1,1} - S, \quad h^{2,1} \mapsto h^{2,1} + R - S \tag{3.20}$$

for the change in Hodge numbers. In this case we have a clear understanding, following [14,15] of the solitonic states responsible for the new massless particles. These are obtained by wrapping 2 branes (presumably D-branes of the type IIA string) around 2 spheres. These are charged with respect to the R-R $U(1)$'s corresponding to the Kähler moduli; but by our assumptions the charges factor through a $U(1)^S$. These states become massless at the transition, and the transition occurs by Higgsing the $U(1)^S$. Examples of these transitions are given in [56,18]; in the latter example, it is shown that the gauge-theoretic description of the transition we give here matches with the description of the transition between the heterotic duals.

3.5. Monodromy

Our gauge-theoretic model has given us a prediction for integral monodromy. We verify this using the IIA interpretation of the model. Rather than dealing directly with period integrals, we calculate with their mirrors.

Our verification is based on the connection between period integrals and Yukawa couplings dictated by special geometry [29]. On the type IIB side, if we choose a holomorphic three-form Ω and a symplectic basis $\{\alpha_i, \beta^i\}$ for the homology cycles, then the corresponding periods

$$a_i := \int_{\alpha_i} \Omega \ , \qquad a_D^i := \int_{\beta^i} \Omega \tag{3.21}$$

are related to the prepotential $\mathcal{F}$ through the formula

$$a_D^i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial a_i} \ . \tag{3.22}$$

On the other hand, the cycles α_i determine marginal operators $\mathcal{O}_i$, the three-point functions among which are

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_i \mathcal{O}_j \mathcal{O}_k \rangle = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{F}}{\partial a_i \partial a_j \partial a_k} \ . \tag{3.23}$$

We can thus determine the behavior of the periods from the behavior of the three-point functions. The a_i's are the flat coordinates in this space; on the mirror model, these are the coefficients in an expansion of the Kähler class with respect to a fixed topological basis of $H^2(M)$.

On the type IIA side, we have found an explicit description of the moduli space and the three-point functions. We only need to calculate the monodromy associated with one of the reflections which generate S_N, which we have previously represented as an elementary transformation. The 4-cycle E and the 2-cycle Γ of this transformation form a two-dimensional subspace of the even cohomology which contains everything which is varying as we perform our monodromy. Note that we can work on the covering space of the moduli space which is a product of Kähler and complex moduli, where the path along which we calculate monodromy is not closed.

We choose a basis of $H^2(M)$ which includes E as the first basis element, and let a_1 be its coefficient in the expansion of the Kähler class. Our singularity lies at $q_1 = 1$. From (3.10) we see that the three-point function $\langle \mathcal{O}_E \mathcal{O}_E \mathcal{O}_E \rangle$ has a simple pole there with leading term

$$\frac{q_1^{-2}}{1 - q_1^{-2}} N_\Gamma (E \cdot \Gamma)^3 \ ; \tag{3.24}$$

moreover, we know that $N_\Gamma = 2g-2$ and $E\cdot\Gamma = -2$. The area of the 2-sphere Γ is $a = -2a_1$. Our path connects a base point to its image under the elementary transformation ρ; since ρ maps E to $-E$, the map on the coefficient must be $a_1 \mapsto -a_1$. This gives the action of the monodromy on a as being $a \mapsto -a$.

To compute the monodromy action on a_D we must be a bit careful. Although the classes E and Γ span the generalized eigenspace with eigenvalue -1 for the monodromy transformation, they are not part of a symplectic basis for $H^{even}(M, \mathbf{Z})$. (They are the closest we can come to a symplectic, integral basis within that space however.) Since the partial derivative $\partial\mathcal{F}/\partial a$ gives the period corresponding to the symplectic partner of E, i.e., corresponding to $-\Gamma/2$, the period a_D corresponding to Γ must be given by $-2\,\partial\mathcal{F}/\partial a$.

To find the monodromy action, we calculate using (3.23) and (3.24):

$$\frac{\partial^3\mathcal{F}}{\partial a^3} = -\frac{1}{8}\frac{\partial^3\mathcal{F}}{\partial a_1^3} = -\frac{1}{8}\langle\mathcal{O}_E\mathcal{O}_E\mathcal{O}_E\rangle = \frac{q_1^{-2}}{1-q_1^{-2}}(2g-2)+\cdots = \frac{-1}{2\pi i a}(2g-2)+\cdots\ . \tag{3.25}$$

Integrating twice and multiplying by -2, we obtain

$$a_D \sim \frac{2g-2}{\pi i} a\log a\ , \tag{3.26}$$

verifying (2.9) and hence (2.10). In particular, we see here the logarithmic corrections to a_D, the monopole mass, arising from world-sheet instanton effects.

It is also possible—at least in a few examples—to directly verify (2.10) for the period integrals in a IIB interpretation of the model. (These calculations are expected to be equivalent in general according to the conjectures of [57].) We will discuss this direct verification in the next section.

3.6. One-Loop Amplitude

We can calculate the leading power-law behavior of the one-loop topological amplitude F_1 for all of our examples. This can be done following methods developed in [58–60,56].

We consider the IIA theory on M, and start by calculating the Kähler cone of M using either toric geometry or the calculation of the secondary fan.[22] In the sequel, we will denote the primitive integral generators of the Kähler cone by $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_k$. The Mori cone of M can then be computed as the dual of its Kähler cone. This gives coordinates

[22] It should be noted that the Kähler cone of the toric variety can be different from the Kähler cone of M [61,56].

z_i on the instanton corrected Kähler moduli space of M, or equivalently on the complex structure moduli space of W.

Using the methods of [59,60,56] we can calculate the principal parts of the Picard–Fuchs differential operators, and input this data and the Mori cone into the program INSTANTON which was appended to the hep-th version of [60]. This gives us the mirror map (the flat coordinates t_i as a function of the algebraic coordinates z_i) and the fundamental period ϖ_0.

From the generalization of the formula of [58] to Calabi–Yau threefolds with more than one modulus we have

$$F_1^{\rm top} = \log\left(\frac{1}{\varpi_0^{3+h^{1,1}(M)-\frac{\chi(M)}{12}}} f(z) \frac{\partial(z_1,\ldots,z_k)}{\partial(t_1,\ldots,t_k)}\right) \tag{3.27}$$

for some function $f(z)$ which is holomorphic on the interior of the moduli space. The boundary of the moduli space consists of two types of divisors—toric boundary divisors and components of the discriminant locus. The toric boundary divisors are defined in our coordinates by monomials in the z_i. The components of the discriminant will be denoted by Δ_i. With these conventions, the unknown holomorphic function f above must take the form

$$f = \prod_i \Delta_i^{r_i} \prod_j z_j^{s_j} \tag{3.28}$$

for some unknown exponents $r_i,\ s_j$. The calculation of $F_1^{\rm top}$ is thus reduced to the calculation of these exponents. We order the components Δ_i so that Δ_1 is the principal component of the discriminant and Δ_2 is the component along which our transition occurs, namely the one which we have identified with the discriminant of (3.3).

The calculation proceeds in two steps. We first use the asymptotic result from [58] (where the normalization of the t_i differs from ours by a factor of $2\pi i$)

$$F_1^{\rm top} \sim -\frac{2\pi i}{12} \sum_i \frac{c_2(M)\cdot J_i}{12} t_i \tag{3.29}$$

to express the s_j in terms of the r_i. Next, the numbers of elliptic curves on M can be computed from the expansion of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} F_1^{\rm top}$ in terms of the s_i.

The next step is to use simple geometric arguments to show that there are no elliptic curves in certain low degree homology classes. This enables us to solve for the r_i. We will illustrate the procedure in an explicit example in the next section.

In our cases, we will always have a component of the discriminant corresponding to the transitions we are considering here. In all cases, the corresponding exponent r_i agrees with the results predicted from our gauge-theoretic description. To see this, note that the prediction (2.12) in subsection *2.2* was expressed in terms of the variable $u \sim z^2$. Implementing the change of variables and remembering the Jacobian factor in (3.27) we extract the prediction

$$r_2 = -\frac{g+2}{6} \ , \tag{3.30}$$

which is verified in all of the examples listed below.

Example 1: $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}[12](2,128) \to \mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,1,1,1,3)}[2,6](1,129)$
(ref. [40]) $N = 2, g = 2, r_2 = -4/6$

Example 2: $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,2)}[8](2,86) \to \mathbf{P}^5[2,6](1,89)$
(ref. [40]) $N = 2, g = 3, r_2 = -5/6$

Example 3: $\mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,2,2,2,2)}[4,6](2,68) \to \mathbf{P}^6[2,2,3](1,73)$
(ref. [60]) $N = 2, g = 4, r_2 = -6/6$

Example 4: $\mathbf{P}^6_{(1,1,2,2,2,2,2)}[4,4,4](2,58) \to \mathbf{P}^7[2,2,2,2](1,65)$
(ref. [60]) $N = 2, g = 5, r_2 = -7/6$

Example 5: $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,2,2,2,7)}[14](2,122) \to \mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,1,1,4)}[8](1,149)$
(ref. [60]) $N = 2, g = 15, r_2 = -17/6$

Example 6: $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,2,3,3,3)}[12](3,69) \to \mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,1,1,1,2)}[3,4](1,79)$
(sec. 4) $N = 3, g = 3, r_2 = -5/6$

In the first line of each example, the transition from Coulomb to Higgs branch is described geometrically. In the second line we give the indices N (labeling the gauge group), g (the genus of the singular curve labeling the number of matter hypermultiplets) and r_2, the coefficient the logarithmic term in $F_1^{\rm top}$. We also give the relevant reference for the computation. The explicit calculations for the first example (which has a conjectured heterotic dual) and the last example (which has an $SU(3)$ enhanced symmetry) are in the next section.

4. Two Examples

In this section we discuss in detail the first and last examples in the list above. The first of these was chosen because of the role that it plays in heterotic/type II duality [8,9]: there is a conjecture [8] that this example is dual to a particular compactification of heterotic string theory. Enhanced gauge symmetry in the context of string duality was discussed in [8,10,13] for the case in which the point of enhanced symmetry lies at weak coupling for the heterotic model. As we shall see, this is not the case for the transition we study here.

4.1. An Example with a Heterotic Dual

We study type IIA string theory compactified on the Calabi–Yau hypersurface M in weighted projective space $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$, or equivalently type IIB string theory on its mirror W. The massless spectrum of the model contains two massless vector multiplets and 129 massless hypermultiplets, and the moduli space of vacua is parameterized by the expectation values of the scalars in these multiplets. By the nonrenormalization theorem of [14,23] the geometry of the scalars in the vector multiplets can be computed at string tree level. This model has been extensively studied; in particular, the moduli space of the scalars in the two vector multiplets is well understood. Of special importance to us is the singular locus. This has two components, one of which was studied in detail (at a particular limiting point) in [8]. We will concentrate on the other component.

This is described as follows. M is given by the vanishing locus of a quasihomogeneous polynomial of degree twelve. The mirror manifold W is given at one point in moduli space by a $\mathbf{Z}_6^2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ quotient of M. The most general polynomial of degree twelve invariant under the quotient is of the form

$$P = x_1^{12} + x_2^{12} + x_3^6 + x_4^6 + x_5^2 - 12\psi x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 x_5 - 4\phi x_1^6 x_2^6 \ . \tag{4.1}$$

The $\mathbf{Z}_6^2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ quotient thus leads to a two-parameter family of complex structures on the mirror W, in this example mapping out the entire space. The singularity in question arises when $\phi^2 = 1/4$, for which the polynomial is singular at the four points $(1, \omega^j, 0, 0, 0)$ where $\omega^6 = 1$. These are identified under the quotient leading to one singular point on the quotient. The quotient, of course, generates orbifold singularities in the ambient space, and the smooth mirror model can be obtained by toric blowups of these. The singularity in question lies at the intersection of several such orbifold loci, and we need to study

the toric resolution. To this end we add two new rays to the fan defining the ambient space as a toric variety. This means we add two new homogeneous coordinates and two new $\mathbf{C}^*$ identifications, in the process introducing two exceptional divisors to resolve the singularity.

Explicitly, the polytope Δ may be taken to have vertices

$$(-1,-1,-1,-1),(11,-1,-1,-1),(-1,5,-1,-1),$$

$$(-1,-1,5,-1),(-1,-1,-1,1)$$

and the polar polytope Δ° has vertices

$$(-1,-2,-2,-6),(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),$$

$$(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1).$$

The face Δ_2 is spanned by the vectors $(-1,5,-1,-1),(-1,-1,5,-1)$, and $(-1,-1,-1,1)$ while the edge Δ_1^* is spanned by $(-1,-2,-2,-6),(1,0,0,0)$. The face Δ_2 has the two interior points $(-1,1,0,0),(-1,0,1,0)$ while Δ_2^* has the unique interior point $(0,-1,-1,-3)$. Thus $g=2$, and V contains an irreducible exceptional divisor resolving a genus 2 curve of A_1 singularities.

To obtain a local description near the singularity we focus on the four-dimensional cone spanned by the points

$$(-1,-1,-1,-1),(-1,1,0,0),(-1,0,1,0),(-1,-1,-1,1)$$

of Δ, which gives coordinates which we call (x_1,s,t,x_5) (s and t correspond to the variables that were called x_1 and x_2 in (3.4)and (3.6). x_1 and x_5 correspond to the similarly named variables of the weighted projective space). This brings P to the form

$$P = x_1^{12} - 4\phi x_1^6 + 1 + st(s+t+x_5^2 - 12\psi x_1 x_5)\ . \tag{4.2}$$

We can now see explicitly the two non-toric divisor classes, in that the intersection of W with each of the two exceptional divisors has two components (given by two solutions of the quadratic equation to which P reduces as discussed above) which coalesce at the singularity.

We see that at $\phi^2 = 1/4$, the model is singular along a reducible curve. Making the choice $\phi = 1/2$, we see that the singular curve consists of the following rational components, all contained in the hypersurface $x_1 = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & s = t = 0 \\ & s = s + t + x_5^2 - 12\psi x_5 = 0 \\ & t = s + t + x_5^2 - 12\psi x_5 = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

These components intersect at the two points

$$(x_1, s, t, x_5) = (1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 12\psi) \ .$$

The geometry of M is simpler. The weighted projective space $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$ is singular along the surface $x_1 = x_2 = 0$. Blowing it up yields a toric variety whose exceptional divisor (corresponding to the edge spanned by $(0, -1, -1, -3)$ above) is a $\mathbf{P}^1$ bundle over the weighted projective space $\mathbf{P}^2_{(2,2,6)} = \mathbf{P}^2_{(1,1,3)}$. After restricting to the exceptional divisor, the equation for M reduces to an equation in the coordinates of $\mathbf{P}^2_{(1,1,3)}$ which is quasi-homogeneous of degree 6. Its zero locus is a genus $g = 2$ curve of A_1 singularities when identified with the surface $x_1 = x_2 = 0$ in $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$, and also gives the equation of a $\mathbf{P}^1$ bundle over a genus 2 curve in the blowup.

Monodromy

The prediction about integer monodromy can be verified directly on the IIB side in this example, and in the related example $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,2)}$. (Each of these models has two components to the discriminant divisor; our transition occurs at the non-principal component.) In general, such verifications are very difficult because it is hard to compute integral bases for cohomology.

The $\mathbf{Z}$-monodromy matrices about the non-principal component for both $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$ and $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,2)}$ are computed in [40]; the monodromy matrix for our present example $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$ is in [10] as well using different bases. We note that in each case, the monodromy matrix has eigenvalues ± 1. The generalized $(+1)$-eigenspace is four-dimensional, and the generalized (-1)-eigenspace is two-dimensional. We choose a $\mathbf{Z}$ basis for each of these

generalized eigenspaces, and then take the union of these two bases to get a basis for the full cohomology.[23] In this new basis, the monodromy matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 2(g-1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.4}$$

in both the $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,6)}$ and $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,1,2,2,2)}$ models, with $g = 2$ in the first and $g = 3$ in the second. This is in complete agreement with our gauge-theoretic prediction (2.10).

The Heterotic Dual

In [8] evidence was given that this model is dual to a heterotic string theory obtained from a $K3 \times T^2$ compactification where T^2 has $\tau = \rho$ by Higgsing all of the nonabelian gauge symmetries. The two scalars in vector multiplets were identified in the heterotic theory as the modulus τ of T^2 and the dilaton S. A study of the (other component of the) discriminant locus at a particular limiting point led to an identification

$$\begin{aligned} j(\tau) &= \frac{(12\psi)^6}{2\phi} \\ e^S &= \phi^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $j(\tau)$ is the modular invariant. These were shown to hold to first order about the weak-coupling limit $S = -\infty$. In [8,62] it is argued that the exact form of this is given by equating S, τ with the *flat* coordinate approximating the RHS of (4.5) at large-S. These identifications locate the locus of enhanced symmetry $\phi^2 = 1$ at strong coupling in the heterotic model.

In any event, the enhanced gauge symmetry we observe, as well as the new branch of hypermultiplet moduli space corresponding to our Higgs branch have no analog in perturbative heterotic string theory. This appears at first sight to contradict the nonrenormalization theorem of [14,23] which in the heterotic string case states that the hypermultiplet moduli space should be independent of the string coupling. This contradiction is resolved if far out along the new branch we do not find weakly coupled heterotic strings. We are thus being given a glimpse of strong-coupling effects in the heterotic theory. We do not, at this point, have an interpretation of these effects directly in the heterotic model. In particular, we do not know how to represent the light states as heterotic solitons.

[23] The resulting basis is no longer a $\mathbf{Z}$ basis, but this is not relevant for our comparison with gauge theory.

4.2. An Example with $SU(3)$ Gauge Symmetry

In this subsection, we summarize the calculations for the example of $\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,2,3,3,3)}[12]$, which has $SU(3)$ enhanced gauge symmetry.

This weighted projective space has A_2 singularities along the $\mathbf{P}^2$ defined by $x_1 = x_2 = 0$. We can blow up this $\mathbf{P}^2$ torically, obtaining a toric variety whose fan has edges are spanned by

$$(-2,-3,-3,-3),(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),$$

$$(0,0,0,1),(-1,-2,-2,-2),(0,-1,-1,-1).$$

The last two edges correspond to the exceptional divisors of the blowup.

A degree 12 hypersurface intersects our $\mathbf{P}^2$ in a degree 4 curve of genus $g = 3$. Correspondingly, the Calabi–Yau hypersurface M contains two ruled surfaces over a genus 3 curve. We compute that $h^{1,1}(M) = 3$ and $h^{2,1}(M) = 69$. We then compute the Mori cone of M. In the notation of [60], it is generated by

$$(-4,-1,0,1,1,1,2,0),(0,1,0,0,0,0,-2,1),(0,0,1,0,0,0,1,-2). \tag{4.6}$$

The last two generators are the classes of the fibers the two exceptional divisors.

The program INSTANTON computes the Gromov–Witten invariants as

$n_{0,0,1} = 4$	$n_{0,0,2} = 0$	$n_{0,0,3} = 0$	$n_{0,0,4} = 0$
$n_{0,0,5} = 0$	$n_{0,0,6} = 0$	$n_{0,1,0} = 4$	$n_{0,1,1} = 4$
$n_{0,2,0} = 0$	$n_{0,2,2} = 0$	$n_{0,3,0} = 0$	$n_{0,3,3} = 0$
$n_{0,4,0} = 0$	$n_{0,5,0} = 0$	$n_{0,6,0} = 0$	$n_{1,0,0} = 56$
$n_{1,1,0} = 592$	$n_{1,1,1} = 592$	$n_{1,2,0} = 56$	$n_{1,2,1} = 592$
$n_{1,2,2} = 56$	$n_{2,0,0} = -272$	$n_{2,1,0} = 552$	$n_{2,1,1} = 552$
$n_{2,2,0} = 9144$	$n_{2,2,1} = 64544$	$n_{2,2,2} = 9144$	$n_{2,3,0} = 552$
$n_{2,3,1} = 64544$	$n_{2,4,0} = -272$	$n_{3,0,0} = 3240$	$n_{3,1,0} = -9088$
$n_{3,1,1} = -9088$	$n_{3,2,0} = 15440$	$n_{3,2,1} = 101664$	$n_{3,3,0} = 271824$
$n_{4,0,0} = -58432$	$n_{4,1,0} = 200268$	$n_{4,1,1} = 200268$	$n_{4,2,0} = -372416$
$n_{5,0,0} = 1303840$	$n_{5,1,0} = -5266176$	$n_{6,0,0} = -33255216$	

Note that $n_{0,1,0} = n_{0,0,1} = n_{0,1,1} = 4 = 2g - 2$, which reflects the $SU(3)$ gauge symmetry in the way that we discussed earlier. Similarly, several of the instanton numbers above are seen to occur in triplets.

We next turn to the calculation of F_1. We do this using the general strategy described earlier.[24]

We choose coordinates z_1, z_2, z_3 near the large complex structure limit, in the order dictated by our choice of the Mori cone. The discriminant has two components, which may be computed by the method of [63,64] to be

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1 &= 1 + 64z_1 - 768z_1z_2 - 32768z_1^2z_2 + 196608z_1^2z_2^2 + 4194304z_1^3z_2^2 \\ &\quad - 16777216z_1^3z_2^3 - 294912z_1^2z_2^2z_3 - 16777216z_1^3z_2^2z_3 \\ &\quad + 75497472z_1^3z_2^3z_3 - 113246208z_1^3z_2^4z_3^2 \\ \Delta_2 &= 1 - 4z_2 - 4z_3 + 18z_2z_3 - 27z_2^2z_3^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since $\chi(M) = -132$, we then have by (3.27)

$$F_1^{\text{top}} = \log(\frac{1}{\varpi_0^{17}}\Delta_1^{r_1}\Delta_2^{r_2}z_1^{s_1}z_2^{s_2}z_3^{s_3}). \tag{4.8}$$

for some undetermined exponents r_i, s_j. Using this expression, the asymptotics which can be calculated from $c_2(M)$, and the non-existence of certain elliptic curves we can infer the values

$$(r_1, r_2) = (-\frac{1}{6}, -\frac{5}{6}),\ (s_1, s_2, s_3) = (-5, -\frac{17}{6}, -3). \tag{4.9}$$

The exponent r_2 agrees with our gauge-theoretic prediction.

The transition occurs when the exceptional divisors get blown down. The monomials which effect the blow down must intersect the last two generators of (4.6) trivially. These are given by the monomials

$$x_1^3x_6^2x_7, x_1x_2x_6x_7, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_2^3x_6x_7^2. \tag{4.10}$$

In the above, the x_i are the homogeneous coordinates of the toric variety. Assigning new variables $y_1, \ldots, y_6$ to the respective monomials in (4.10), we see that the identity $y_1y_6 = y_2^3$ holds. By examining the weights, we thus see that we reach a complete intersection $\mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,1,1,1,2)}[3,4]$. Its Hodge numbers are calculated to be $h^{1,1} = 1$ and $h^{2,1} = 79$, as anticipated by (3.19).

[24] We are grateful to A. Klemm for sharing some computer code with us which we used to check our calculations.

Note added: As this work was being readied for publication we received a preprint [65] which overlaps this paper to a certain extent. It contains two examples not considered here, but which further confirm our results (the genus is not calculated in [65]):

Ex. 7 of [65] $$\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,2,2,3,4)}[12](2,74) \to \mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,1,2,2,3)}[6,4](1,79)$$
$$N = 2, g = 4, r_2 = -6/6$$

Ex. 11 of [65] $$\mathbf{P}^4_{(1,2,3,3,9)}[18](3,99) \to \mathbf{P}^5_{(1,1,1,1,2,3)}[3,6](1,103)$$
$$N = 3, g = 2, r_2 = -4/6$$

Acknowledgments

We thank Brian Greene for collaboration in the early stages of this work. We also thank P. Aspinwall, P. Berglund, P. Candelas, A. Font, M. Gross, A. Klemm, D. Kutasov, A. Schwimmer, N. Seiberg, C. Vafa, and especially Y. Oz for discussions, and N. Seiberg for comments on an early version of the manuscript. D.R.M. would like to thank the Center for Basic Interactions and the Einstein Center at the Weizmann Institute of Science for hospitality during the final stages of this project. The work of S.K. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-9311386, the work of D.R.M. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-9401447, and the work of M.R.P. was supported by the Center for Basic Interactions.

References

[1] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, *Unity of Superstring Dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109–137. [hep-th/9410167]

[2] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, and A. Van Proyen, *Duality Transformations in Supersymmetric Yang–Mills Theories Coupled to Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B444** (1995) 92–124. [hep-th/9502072]

[3] E. Witten, *String Theory Dynamics in Various Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 85–126. [hep-th/9503124]

[4] J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *The Heterotic String is a Soliton*, Nucl. Phys. **B449** (1995) 535–552. [hep-th/9504047]

[5] P. S. Aspinwall, *Enhanced Gauge Symmetries and $K3$ Surfaces*, Phys. Lett. **B357** (1995) 329–334. [hep-th/9507012]

[6] E. Witten, *Some Comments On String Dynamics*, Proc. Strings '95. [hep-th/9507121]

[7] D. Kutasov, *Orbifolds and Solitons.* [hep-th/9512145]

[8] S. Kachru and C. Vafa, *Exact Results for N=2 Compactifications of Heterotic Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B450** (1995) 69–89. [hep-th/9505105]

[9] S. Ferrara, J. A. Harvey, A. Strominger, and C. Vafa, *Second-Quantized Mirror Symmetry*, Phys. Lett. **361B** (1995) 59–68. [hep-th/9505162]

[10] S. Kachru, A. Klemm, W. Lerche, P. Mayr and C. Vafa, *Non-Perturbative Results on the Point Particle Limit of N=2 Heterotic String Compactifications*, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 537–588. [hep-th/9508155]

[11] P. S. Aspinwall, *An N=2 Dual Pair and a Phase Transition*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 57–76. [hep-th/9510142]

[12] M. Bershadsky, V. Sadov, and C. Vafa, *D-Strings on D-Manifolds.* [hep-th/9510225]

[13] P. S. Aspinwall, *Enhanced Gauge Symmetries and Calabi–Yau Threefolds.* [hep-th/9511171]

[14] A. Strominger, *Massless Black Holes and Conifolds in String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B451** (1995) 97–109. [hep-th/9504090]

[15] B. R. Greene, D. R. Morrison, and A. Strominger, *Black Hole Condensation and the Unification of String Vacua*, Nucl. Phys. **B451** (1995) 109–120. [hep-th/9504145]

[16] Y. Hayakawa, *Degeneration of Calabi–Yau Manifold with Weil–Petersson Metric.* [alg-geom/9507016]

[17] M. Reid, *Canonical 3-Folds*, Journées de Géométrie Algébrique d'Angers (A. Beauville, ed.), Sijthoff and Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1980, pp. 273–310.

[18] P. Berglund, S. Katz, and A. Klemm, *Extremal Transitions between Dual N=2 String Models*, in preparation.

[19] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *Two-Dimensional Black Hole and Singularities of CY Manifolds.* [hep-th/9511164]

[20] M. Bershadsky, V. Sadov, and C. Vafa, *D-Branes and Topological Field Theories*. [hep-th/9511222]

[21] P. S. Aspinwall and D. R. Morrison, *U-Duality and Integral Structures*, Phys. Lett. **355B** (1995) 141–149. [hep-th/9505025]

[22] D. R. Morrison, *Mirror Symmetry and the Type II String*, Proc. Trieste Workshop on S-Duality and Mirror Symmetry. [hep-th/9512016]

[23] K. Becker, M. Becker, and A. Strominger, *Fivebranes, Membranes and Non-Perturbative String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B456** (1995) 130–152. [hep-th/9507158]

[24] E. Witten, *Phases of N=2 Theories In Two Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B403** (1993) 159–222. [hep-th/9301042]

[25] P. S. Aspinwall, B. R. Greene, and D. R. Morrison, *Calabi–Yau Moduli Space, Mirror Manifolds and Spacetime Topology Change in String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 414–480. [hep-th/9309097]

[26] E. Witten, *Topological Quantum Field Theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. **117** (1988) 353–386.

[27] M. Duff, *Strong/Weak Coupling Duality from the Dual String*, Nucl. Phys. **B442** (1995) 47–63. [hep-th/9501030]

[28] N. Seiberg, *Supersymmetry and Non-Perturbative Beta Functions*, Phys. Lett. **206B** (1988) 75–80.

[29] A. Strominger, *Special Geometry*, Commun. Math. Phys. **133** (1990) 163–180.

[30] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Electromagnetic Duality, Monopole Condensation and Confinement in N=2 Supersymmetric Yang–Mills Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19–52. [hep-th/9407087]

[31] C. Vafa, *A Stringy Test of the Fate of the Conifold*, Nucl. Phys. **B447** (1995) 252–260. [hep-th/9505023]

[32] E. Witten, *Bound States of Strings and p-Branes*. [hep-th/9510135]

[33] A. Strominger, *Open p-Branes*. [hep-th/9512059]

[34] B. R. Greene, A. Shapere, C. Vafa, and S.-T. Yau, *Stringy Cosmic Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B337** (1990) 1–36.

[35] P. S. Aspinwall and D. R. Morrison, *String Theory on $K3$ Surfaces*, Essays on Mirror Manifolds II (B. R. Greene and S.-T. Yau, eds.), to appear. [hep-th/9404151]

[36] C. Callan, J. Harvey and A. Strominger, *Supersymmetric String Solitons*, Proc. of 1991 Trieste Spring School, String Theory and Quantum Gravity (1991) 208–244. [hep-th/9112030]

[37] E. G. Gimon and J. Polchinski, *Consistency Conditions for Orientifolds and D-Manifolds*. [hep-th/9601038]

[38] K. Kodaira, *On Compact Analytic Surfaces, II–III*, Annals of Math. **77** (1963) 563–626; **78** (1963) 1–40.

[39] V. V. Batyrev, *Dual Polyhedra and Mirror Symmetry for Calabi–Yau Hypersurfaces in Toric Varieties*, J. Alg. Geom. **3** (1994) 493–535. [alg-geom/9310003]

[40] P. Candelas, X. de la Ossa, A. Font, S. Katz, and D. R. Morrison, *Mirror Symmetry for Two Parameter Models (I)*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 481–562. [hep-th/9308083]

[41] C. Gómez, R. Hernández and E. López, *S-Duality and the Calabi–Yau Interpretation of the N=4 to N=2 Flow*. [hep-th/9512017]

[42] I. M. Gel'fand, A. V. Zelevinskiĭ and M. M. Kapranov, *Hypergeometric Functions and Toral (Toric) Manifolds*, Func. Anal. Appl. **28** (1989) 94–106 (from Russian in Funk. Anal. Pril. **23**).

[43] P. S. Aspinwall, B. R. Greene and D. R. Morrison, *Measuring Small Distances in N=2 Sigma Models*, Nucl. Phys. **B420** (1994) 184–242. [hep-th/9311042]

[44] P. Candelas, X. C. de la Ossa, P. S. Green, and L. Parkes, *A Pair of Calabi–Yau Manifolds as an Exactly Soluble Superconformal Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B359** (1991) 21–74.

[45] P. S. Aspinwall and D. R. Morrison, *Topological Field Theory and Rational Curves*, Commun. Math. Phys. **151** (1993) 245–262.

[46] D. R. Morrison, *Beyond the Kähler Cone*, Proc. of the Hirzebruch 65 Conference on Algebraic Geometry (M. Teicher, ed.), Israel Math. Conf. Proc., vol. 9, Bar-Ilan University, 1996, pp. 361–376. [alg-geom/9407007]

[47] D. Burns, Jr. and M. Rapoport, *On the Torelli Problem for Kählerian $K3$ Surfaces*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **8** (1975) 235–274.

[48] P. M. H. Wilson, *The Kähler Cone on Calabi–Yau Threefolds*, Inv. Math. **107** (1992) 561–583.

[49] D. R. Morrison, *Through the Looking Glass*, Lecture at CIRM conference, Trento (June, 1994), to appear.

[50] Y. Namikawa and J. H. M. Steenbrink, *Global Smoothing of Calabi–Yau Threefolds*, Inv. Math. **122** (1995) 403–419.

[51] M. Gross, *Deforming Calabi–Yau Threefolds*. [alg-geom/9506022]

[52] M. Gross, *Primitive Calabi–Yau Threefolds*. [alg-geom/9512002]

[53] C. H. Clemens and P. A. Griffiths, *The Intermediate Jacobian of the Cubic Threefold*, Annals of Math. **95** (1972) 281–356.

[54] N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie*, Hermann, Paris, 1968.

[55] T. E. Zerger, *Contracting Rational Curves on Smooth Complex Threefolds*, Ph.D. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1996.

[56] P. Berglund, S. Katz, and A. Klemm, *Mirror Symmetry and the Moduli Space for Generic Hypersurfaces in Toric Varieties*, Nucl. Phys. **B456** (1995) 153–204. [hep-th/9506091]

[57] D. R. Morrison, *Making Enumerative Predictions by Means of Mirror Symmetry*, Essays on Mirror Manifolds II (B. R. Greene and S.-T. Yau, eds.), to appear. [alg-geom/9504013]

[58] M. Bershadsky, S. Cecotti, H. Ooguri, and C. Vafa, *Holomorphic Anomalies in Topological Field Theories* (with an appendix by S. Katz), Nucl. Phys. **B405** (1993) 279–304. [hep-th/9302103]

[59] S. Hosono, A. Klemm, S. Theisen, and S.-T. Yau, *Mirror Symmetry, Mirror Map and Applications to Calabi–Yau Hypersurfaces*, Commun. Math. Phys. **167** (1995) 301–350. [hep-th/9308122]

[60] S. Hosono, A. Klemm, S. Theisen, and S.-T. Yau, *Mirror Symmetry, Mirror Map and Applications to Complete Intersection Calabi–Yau Spaces*, Nucl. Phys. **B433** (1995) 501–554. [hep-th/9406055]

[61] P. S. Aspinwall, B. R. Greene, and D. R. Morrison, *The Monomial-Divisor Mirror Map*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1993) 319–337. [alg-geom/9309007]

[62] P. S. Aspinwall and J. Louis, *On the Ubiquity of $K3$ Fibrations in String Duality.* [hep-th/9510234]

[63] M. M. Kapranov, *A Characterization of A-Discriminantal Hypersurfaces in Terms of the Logarithmic Gauss Map*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991) 277–285.

[64] D. R. Morrison and M. R. Plesser, *Summing the Instantons: Quantum Cohomology and Mirror Symmetry in Toric Varieties*, Nucl. Phys. **B440** (1995) 279–354. [hep-th/9412236]

[65] A. Klemm and P. Mayr, *Strong Coupling Singularities and Non-Abelian Gauge Symmetries in N=2 String Theory.* [hep-th/9601014]